REMARKS

The present application has been reviewed in light of the Office Action dated October 27, 2008. Claims 1-10, 12-27, 29-36, 39, 40, 43, and 44-50 are presented for examination, of which Claims 1, 12, 23, and 29 are in independent form. Claims 45-50 have been added to provide Applicants with a more complete scope of protection. Claims 1, 12, 23, 24, 27, 29, 30, 33, 34, 35, and 36 have been amended to define aspects of Applicants' invention more clearly. Favorable reconsideration is requested.

The Office Action objected to Claims 12 and 29[1] for certain informalities. Applicants have amended Claims 12 and 29, as suggested by the Examiner in section 10 of the Office Action. It is believed that the objections have been obviated, and their withdrawal is therefore respectfully requested.

The Office Action states that Claims 1-10, 12-27, 29-36, 39, 40, 43, and 44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0018818 (*Boliek et al.*) in view of what was alleged to have been well known in the art. For at least the following reasons, Applicants submit that independent Claims 1, 12, 23, and 29, together with the claims dependent therefrom, are patentably distinct from the cited prior art.

The aspect of the present invention set forth in Claim 1 is directed to a method of processing a request from a first communication apparatus connected through a communication network to a remote second communication apparatus, where the method is implemented in the second apparatus. The method includes the steps of: (1) receiving

---

[1] Applicants presume that the objection was meant to be directed to Claims 12 and 29 --not 40 as noted. If this presumption is incorrect, Applicants respectfully request clarification.

the request, wherein the request is for obtaining digital data of a compressed digital signal that comprises header data and a signal body comprising data packets; (2) processing the request including determining a position, in the body of the signal, of at least one data packet corresponding to the request as a function of the length of the header data and of at least one pointer marker present in the header data of the signal, the at least one pointer marker providing information for calculating the length of the part of the body preceding the data packet under consideration; and (3)forming, prior to the processing, the at least one pointer marker in the signal when at least one point marker providing information for calculating the length of the part of the signal body is not present in the header.

A notable feature of Claim 1 is that, when the point marker is not present in the header, the pointer marker is formed in the signal prior to processing the request. Support for these features may be found, for example, at page 18, lines 4-15, and in FIG. 3.

Boliek et al. relates to client/server systems that provide for imaging of JPEG 2000 codestreams (paragraph 1). Apparently, *Boliek et al.* discusses that a main header is provided at the beginning of a codestream, and that the main header contains markers that describe image characteristics, a coding style, and other parameters that apply to the whole image or individual components thereof (paragraph 33). *Boliek et al.* also discusses that each of a plurality of tile-parts has a header, wherein the tile-parts are indexed to indicate order, that a first tile-part header of a tile contains information that applies to the whole tile or individual tile-components thereof, and that remaining tile-part headers include only order and length information for that tile-part and/or succeeding tile-parts (paragraph 33). In addition, *Boliek et al.* discusses that a client provides requests to a server to obtain some amount of data corresponding to an image, wherein the data

being requested is part of a codestream stored as a file at the server, and that the server receives the request for bytes of a particular file and transmits them to the client (paragraph 39). As best understood, *Boliek et al.* is silent regarding codestream headers that do not include certain markers, much less, that, when a marker providing information for calculating a length of a part of a signal body is not present, forming the marker in the signal prior to processing a request.

Nothing has been found in *Boliek et al.* that is believed to teach or suggest "forming, prior to the processing, the at least one pointer marker in the signal when at least one point marker providing information for calculating the length of the part of the signal body is not present in the header," as recited in Claim 1. Accordingly, Applicants submit that Claim 1 is patentable over *Boliek et al.*, and respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). Independent Claim 23 includes a feature similar to that of Claim 1, and also is believed to be patentable for at least the reasons discussed above.

The aspect of the present invention set forth in Claim 12 is directed to a method of processing compressed digital data received by a first communication apparatus connected through a communication network to a remote second communication apparatus, wherein the method is implemented in the first communication apparatus. The method includes the steps of: (1) receiving only a portion of a compressed digital signal present in the second apparatus and comprising a body that comprises data packets, the received portion comprising at least one data packet; (2) determining a position at which the at least one data packet of the received portion is to be inserted into the body of a compressed digital signal derived from the compressed digital signal present in the second

apparatus and which is capable of containing all or part of the body of this compressed digital signal, the derived signal also comprising header data, the position being determined as a function of the length of the header data and of at least one pointer marker previously received and inserted into the header data of the derived signal by the first apparatus, the at least one pointer marker providing information for calculating the length of the part of the body preceding the at least one data packet of the received portion; and (3) inserting into the body of the derived signal the at least one data packet of the received portion at the determined position.

Notable features of Claim 12 are that a position is determined at which the at least one data packet of the received portion is to be inserted into the body of a compressed digital signal derived from the compressed digital signal present in the second apparatus and which is capable of containing all or part of the body of this compressed digital signal, the derived signal also comprising header data, that the position is determined as a function of the length of the header data and of at least one pointer marker previously received and inserted into the header data of the derived signal by the first apparatus, wherein the at least one pointer marker providing information for calculating the length of the part of the body preceding the at least one data packet of the received portion, and that the at least one data packet of the received portion at the determined position is inserted into the body of the derived signal.

Boliek et al. discusses that marker segments in an original JPEG 2000 codestream may be changed to create another codestream that a JPEG 2000 compliant decoder may be able to handle, wherein the markers associated with the original JPEG codestream are stored on a server indicate a certain number of tiles and tile parts

(paragraph 46). *Boliek et al.* also discusses that these markers are forwarded with requested bytes of the codestream, and that, because only a portion of the codestream may have been requested, a client modifies the markers so that the markers are correct for the codestream that is generated (paragraph 46). In addition, *Boliek et al.* discusses that, when a thumbnail (lower resolution) version of a codestream is requested, the server provides the requested data, that PLM values provided in the main header are no longer correct, that the PLM values must be updated, because some packets that belong to the higher resolution version are not included in the new codestream, and that a Psot value (length from beginning of the first byte of a SOT (Start of tile-part) marker segment of the tile-part to the end of the data of that tile-part) of the SOT marker as well as Ttlm and Ptlm values of the TLM marker also must be updated to reflect the change (paragraph 46). However, using the method of Claim 12, the first apparatus does not calculate markers used to determine a position of a packet in a body of the derived signal.

Nothing has been found in *Boliek et al.* that is believed to teach or suggest "determining a position at which the at least one data packet of the received portion is to be inserted into the body of a compressed digital signal derived from the compressed digital signal present in the second apparatus and which is capable of containing all or part of the body of this compressed digital signal, the derived signal also comprising header data, the position being determined as a function of the length of the header data and of at least one pointer marker previously received and inserted into the header data of the derived signal by the first apparatus, the at least one pointer marker providing information for calculating the length of the part of the body preceding the at least one data packet of the received portion," and "inserting into the body of the derived signal the at least one

data packet of the received portion at the determined position," as recited in Claim 12. Accordingly, Applicants submit that Claim 12 is patentable over *Boliek et al.*, and respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). Independent Claim 29 includes features similar to those of Claim 12, and also is believed to be patentable for at least the reasons discussed above.

The other claims in the present application depend from one or another of the independent claims discussed above and, therefore, are submitted to be patentable for at least the same reasons. Because each dependent claim also is deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, individual consideration or reconsideration, as the case may be, of the patentability of each claim on its own merits is respectfully requested.

No petition to extend the time for response to the Office Action is deemed necessary for this Amendment. If, however, such a petition is required to make this Amendment timely filed, then this paper should be considered such a petition and the Commissioner is authorized to charge the requisite petition fee to Deposit Account 06-1205.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully request favorable reconsideration and an early passage to issue of the present application.

Applicants' undersigned attorney may be reached in our New York office by telephone at (212) 218-2100. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below listed address.

Respectfully submitted,

/Jonathan Berschadsky/
Jonathan Berschadsky
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 46,551

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-3801
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

FCHS_WS 2798257v1